DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 419 411 FL 025 254

AUTHOR	Dryer, Matthew S.
TITLE	Obviation Across Clause Boundaries in Kutenai.
PUB DATE	1997-00-00
NOTE	20p.; For complete volume, see FL 025 251.
PUB TYPE	Journal Articles (080) -- Reports - Research (143)
JOURNAL CIT	Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics; v22 n2 p33-52 1997
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	American Indian Languages; Language Patterns; *Language Research; *Linguistic Theory; *Sentence Structure; *Structural Analysis (Linguistics); Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS	*Clauses; *Kootenai

ABSTRACT

Kutenai has an obviation system reminiscent of the systems found in Algonquian languages, in which at most one third person nominal in a clause is proximate and others are obviate. Although the behavior of proximate nominals within clauses and within texts reflects a special status for proximates as having some sort of "higher rank" than obviates, it is concluded that there is no evidence of any syntactic conditions governing obviation across clause boundaries apart from those that also apply within clauses, there can be no more than one proximate per sentence, and coreferential nominals must agree in obviation. In particular there is no evidence of any conditions reminiscent of "binding" conditions, or any conditions by which proximates are preferred in higher positions than obviates. (Contains 10 references.) (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 419 411

S. Manuel Dupont

OBVIATION ACROSS CLAUSE BOUNDARIES IN KUTENAI[1]

Matthew S. Dryer
SUNY Buffalo

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Abstract: Kutenai has an obviation system reminiscent of the system found in Algonquian languages in which at most one third person nominal in a clause is proximate and others are obviative. Although the behaviour of proximate nominals within clauses and within texts reflects a special status for proximates, as having some sort of 'higher rank' than obviatives, there are no restrictions across clause boundaries within sentences that require that the proximate be higher in the sentence than proximate nominals.

0. Background

In a number of previous papers (Dryer 1991, 1992, 1994, 1996), I have discussed the mechanisms of obviation in Kutenai as they apply within clauses and across sentences within discourse. In this paper, I examine the intermediate possibility, of obviation within sentences but across clause boundaries. I will argue that there is no evidence of any syntactic conditions governing obviation across clause boundaries apart from those that also apply within clauses. These two conditions are first, that there can be no more than one proximate per sentence and second, coreferential nominals must agree in obviation. In particular there is no evidence of any conditions reminiscent of 'binding' conditions, no conditions by which proximates are preferred in higher positions than obviatives.

I will first summarize the basic properties of obviation within clauses in Kutenai and some other basic aspects of verbal morphology. Within clauses in Kutenai, the assignment of proximate and obviative is governed by the following principle. Among the third person nominals in a clause, the proximate nominal will be the highest third person nominal on the following hierarchy:

(1) subject > primary object > secondary object, oblique

For current purposes, I define subject and primary object in terms of the system of pronominal marking on verbs. Subjects are associated with proclitics for first and second person, and with additional verbal suffixes for first and second person plural. These are illustrated in the following examples.

(2) a. hin ¢xa-ni
2 talk-INDIC
'You (sg.) talked.'

b. hu ¢xa-na↓a?-ni
1 talk-1PL-INDIC
'We talked.'

Objects are associated with verbal suffixes for all combinations of first and second persons, singular and plural. These are illustrated in the following examples, where the subject is third person.

FL 025254

(3) a. wu·kat-ap-ni
see-1SG-INDIC
'He/she/it/they saw me.'

b. wu·kat-is-kiɬ-ni
see-2-2PL-INDIC
'He/she/it/they saw you (pl.).'

Third person participants in Kutenai are not normally indicated on the verb. This is true for both third person singular and plural, which are never distinguished in Kutenai verb forms. This is illustrated in the examples in (3) for third person subjects of transitive verbs. The examples in (4) illustrate this for third person subjects of intransitive verbs.

(4) ¢xa-ni
talk-INDIC
'He/she/they talked.'

The examples in (5) illustrate this for third person objects.

(5) hu wu·kat-i
I see-INDIC
'I saw him/her/it/them.'

There is one situation in which verbs inflect for third person, namely when the subject of the verb is obviative. This is illustrated in (6)[2].

(6) qa˛ɬ ʔakmuxu-s waɬunak-ʔis niʔ watak
PTCL fall.out-OBV tongue-3.POSS the frog
'The Frog's [prox] tongue [obv] would come out.'
(Tape 126, Side B, line 125)

Secondary objects and obliques (which are difficult to distinguish in Kutenai, and which may be best viewed as a single category) are not marked on the verb and must be indicated by separate nominals. Only in fairly unusual circumstances does this arise with first or second persons. When it does arise, independent pronouns are used, as in (7)[3].

(7) ninkuʔis˛¢ k-a¢'kakiɬ niɬsik n-'in-i ¢aʔt-mu
3˛and SUBORD-black bull INDIC-be-INDIC brother-MUTUAL
'Him and Black Bull were brothers' (Tape NS.7, Story 3, line 103)

The example in (8) illustrates a clause where the subject is third person and thus is proximate, but where the object is obviative.

(8) n-'ipiɬ-ni swaʔ-s xaxas
INDIC-kill-INDIC panther-OBV skunk
'Skunk [prox] killed Panther [obv].'
(Boas Text 26: Skunk and Panther, line 25)

According to the hierarchy in (1), if the subject is first or second person, then the primary object will be proximate and all other nominals will be obviative, as in (9).

(9) **qapsin-s k-in-sɬ ʔaqakɬatɬ hamat-kiɕ-kiɬ**
why-OBV SUBORD-2-ASP PRVB give-BENEF-2PL
qapsin-s
thing-OBV
'Why [obv] are you people giving it [prox] stuff [obv]'
(Tape NS.7, Story 2, line 12)

The example in (10) illustrates a case where both the subject and primary object are nonthird person and where an oblique or secondary object is thus proximate.

(10) **qapsin ɕin k-in siɬ ɕi·kat-ap-kiɬ**
why only SUBORD-2 ASP look.at-1SG.OBJ-2PL
'Why [prox] are you looking at me?'
(Boas Text 63: Coyote and Deer, line 44)

Constrast the proximate form of **qapsin** 'why' in (10) with the obviative form **qapsins** in (9) above.

There are two kinds of situations which do not adhere to the hierarchy in (1). First, in the inverse construction, it is the object that is proximate, while the subject is obviative, as in (11).

(11) **wu·kat-aps-i paɬkiy titqaʔ-s**
see-INV-INDIC woman man-OBV
'The man [obviative] saw the woman [proximate].'

Inverse clauses in which both arguments are nominal are not frequent, it being much more common for the object to be pronominal, as in (12).

(12) **qakɬ-aps-i niʔ-s paɬkiy-s**
tell-INVERSE-INDIC the-OBV woman-OBV
'The woman [obv] told them [prox]'
(Boas Text 30: The Woman and the Giant, line 36)

Note that in referring to the subject and object in inverse clauses, I will apply these terms in a semantic sense, despite the fact that I have given reasons (Dryer 1991, 1996), for describing what is semantically the object in inverse clauses as the subject. Ultimately, as argued in Dryer (1996), I view this sort of issue as terminological and nonsubstantive. Note that in inverse clauses like (11) and (12) in which what I am calling the subject is obviative, we do not find what is otherwise obviative subject marking on the verb, a fact which provides a reason for saying that this element is not the subject. As illustrated below (and discussed in Dryer 1991, 1996), if what is semantically the object in an inverse clause is obviative (i.e. if BOTH arguments are obviative), then we do get so-called obviative subject marking on the verb, providing a possible argument for saying that what is semantically the object in inverse clauses is the subject. But I will continue in this paper to use these terms in a more semantic sense.

A second phenomenon that does not conform to the hierarchy in (1), though not really an exception to it, is that in noun phrases involving a noun possessed by a third person, the possessed noun must be obviative. The possessor may or may not be proximate, depending on other factors. Possessed nouns are not inflected for their own obviation, but are inflected for the obviation of the possessor. Thus in (13), the possessed noun bears the third person possessive suffix **-ʔis**, while in (14), the possessed noun bears both the third person possessive suffix and the obviative suffix.

(13) **n-ʾuquxaki-ni** **yiɬkimi-ʔis**
INDIC-put.into-INDIC pot-3POSS
'He$_i$ [prox] put him$_j$ [obv] into his$_i$ [prox] bucket [obv].'
(Boas Text 26: Skunk and Panther, line 5)

(14) **swaʔ** **n-ʾumitɬkin-i** **yiɬkimi-ʔis-is**
panther INDIC-break-INDIC bucket-3POSS-OBV
'Panther$_j$ [prox] broke his$_i$ [obv] bucket [obv].'
(Boas Text 26: Skunk and Panther, line 10)

The obviative status of a noun possessed by a nonthird person can be demonstrated by examples in which it is functioning as subject, as in (6) above or (15), in which we find the obviative subject suffix **-s** on the verb.

(15) **n-aqap-s-i** **tiɬnamu-ʔis** **ʔinɬak**
INDIC-exist-OBV-INDIC wife-3POSS chicken.hawk
'Chicken Hawk had a wife.' (Boas Text 27: The Deluge, line 27)
(Literally: 'Chicken Hawk's [prox] wife [obv] existed')

Note that although the choice of proximate is grammatically determined with possessive constructions, the possessed nominal being obligatorily obviative, there is no grammatical restriction on whether the possessor or some *other* nominal in the clause is proximate. In (14) above, for example, the subject **swaʔ** 'Panther' is proximate and the noncoreferential possessor of the object is obviative. But the opposite choice is also possible, as illustrated in (16), in which the subject is obviative and the possessor of the object is proximate.

(16) **taxa-s** **ɬut-iɬ-s-i** **ʔa·kiɬqay-ʔis**
then-OBV suck-TRANS-OBV-INDIC finger-3POSS
'Then it [obv] sucked on his [prox] finger [obv].'
(Coyote and Yawukiykam Text, line 104)

1. Complement Clauses

Across clause boundaries, there is also some freedom as to what nominal is proximate, constrained by two principles. First, coreferential nominals must agree in obviation; if one is obviative then so must all coreferential ones. Second, as is the case within clauses, there can only be one proximate per sentence. The first of these principles is illustrated in (17), in which the matrix subject is proximate and thus the coreferential subordinate subject must be proximate as well.

(17) **qaki?-ni ma↓i k-¢xa↓ hawasxu?mik.**
say-INDIC Mary SUBORD-FUT sing
'Mary$_i$ [prox] said that she$_i$ [prox] would sing.' (E)

The second principle is illustrated in (18), in which the matrix subject is proximate and the noncoreferential complement subject is obviative.

(18) **qaki?-ni ma↓i k-↓aquqana-s misa↓-s**
say-INDIC Mary SUBORD-leave-OBV Mike-OBV
'Mary$_i$ [prox] said that Mike$_j$ [obv] left.' (E)

The following examples from texts illustrate the same two possibilities. The example in (19) illustrates a sentence in which the matrix subject and complement subject are the same, and the complement verb is not inflected for obviation, reflecting the fact that its subject is to be interpreted as coreferential to the matrix subject.

(19) **taxa-s qaki?-ni tuma k-¢ ?isni↓ mitxa**
then-OBV say-INDIC Tomas SUBORD-FUT be.the.one shoot
'Then Tomas$_i$ [prox] said he$_i$ [prox] would be the one to shoot them$_j$ [obv].' (Tape 146, Story 2, line 182)

The example in (20) illustrates a sentence in which the matrix subject and complement subject are noncoreferential, and hence the complement subject is marked obviative and the complement verb is inflected as having an obviative subject.

(20) **qaki?-ni nasu?kin k-¢xa↓ mitxa-↓-is tuq̓¢qamna-s**
say-INDIC chief SUBORD-FUT shoot-PASS-OBV bird-OBV
'The chief said there was to be a bird shot.'
(Literally: The chief$_i$ [prox] said that a bird$_j$ [obv] would be shot.)
(Tape 21, line 163)

In texts, it is more common for examples to involve pronominal subjects rather than lexical ones, which in the case of third person nominals in Kutenai are implicit, reflected in the absence of any marking with proximate participants and by the obviative subject suffix with obviative participants functioning as subject. In the examples in (21) and (22), the proximate subject of the matrix clause is implicit, but the nonobviative form of the complement verb indicates that the subject of both clauses are the same.

(21) **waha qaki?-ni k-sani↓xu?ni**
no say-INDIC SUBORD-sick
'No, he$_i$ [prox] said he$_i$ [prox] was sick.' (Tape 71, Second Part, line 308)

(22) **qaki?-ni xma-k mat-is**
say-INDIC hypoth-SUBORD beat-2OBJ
'He$_i$ [prox] said he$_i$ [prox] could outrun you.' (Tape 126, Side B, line 28)

But in the examples in (23) and (24), the fact that the subordinate verb is inflected for an obviative subject indicates that its subject is distinct from the matrix subject and is to be interpreted as something from the preceding text distinct from the proximate participant.

(23) **qaki?-ni k-sahan-s**
say-INDIC SUBORD-bad-OBV
'He$_i$ [prox] said it$_j$ [obv] was bad.' (Tape 20, Second Part, line 24)

(24) **taxa-s qa$\dagger$wiy-ni ?in$\dagger$ak k-qaqap-s**
then-OBV think-INDIC hawk SUBORD-be.true-OBV
'Then Hawk$_i$ [prox] thought it$_j$ [obv] was true.' (Tape 21, line 17)

The notion of reference applicable to the notion of corefence includes apparently semantically empty subjects of zero-valence verbs like **wa$\dagger$uq̓kukut** 'rain'. Contrast, for example, the example in (25), in which the matrix subject is first person, and the complement verb is not inflected for obviative subject, with the example in (26), in which the matrix subject is third person and the complement verb IS inflected for obviative subject.

(25) **hu qa$\dagger$wiy-ni k-wa$\dagger$uq̓kukut**
1 think-INDIC SUBORD-rain
'I think that it [prox] rained' (E)

(26) **qa$\dagger$wiy-ni k-wa$\dagger$uq̓kukut-s**
think-INDIC SUBORD-rain-OBV
'He$_i$ [prox] thinks that it$_j$ [obv] rained' (E)

A number of the examples above illustrate instances in which the noncoreferentiality of the subjects in the two clauses can be inferred from the fact that the matrix subject is proximate and the complement subject is obviative. But the opposite situation, in which it is the matrix subject that is obviative and the complement subject that is proximate, while less common, is also possible. The two sentences in (27) and (28) differ only as to which of the two nominals, the matrix subject or the complement subject, is proximate.

(27) **qaki?-ni ma$\dagger$i k-aqwi$\dagger$-s**
say-INDIC Mary SUBORD-dance-OBV
'Mary$_i$ [prox] said that he$_j$ [obv] danced.' (E)

In (27), the matrix subject is proximate, as indicated by the lack of obviative marking on both the subject **ma$\dagger$i** 'Mary' and on the verb **qaki?ni** 'say', while the complement subject is obviative, as is indicated by the obviative subject suffix **-s** on the complement verb **kaqwi$\dagger$s** 'dance'. In (28), in contrast, the matrix subject is obviative, as indicated by obviative marking on both the matrix subject **ma$\dagger$is** 'Mary-obv' and on the matrix verb **qakiksi** 'say-obv', while the complement subject is proximate, as indicated by the absence of obviative marking on the complement verb **kaqwi$\dagger$** 'dance'.

(28) qakik-s-i ma$\frac{1}{2}$i-s k-aqwi$\frac{1}{2}$
say-OBV-INDIC Mary-OBV SUBORD-dance
'Mary$_i$ [obv] said that he$_j$ [prox] danced.' (E)

The choice between the two forms in (27) and (28) is determined by the same sort of discourse factors that in general determine the assignment of proximate. Both of these sentences were provided by a native speaker in a elicitation situation in response to the English prompt 'Mary said that he danced', the form in (27) first and that in (28) second. Thus (28) is not simply a sentence that is judged acceptable. Furthermore, (28) is particularly natural since the matrix subject is an overt noun phrase while the complement subject is pronominal. There is in general a preference in any situation in which one nominal involves an overt noun and the other pronominal for the pronominal one to be the one chosen as proximate. The reasons for this are not syntactic but simply reflect the fact that the discourse conditions in which pronominal reference occurs are similar to those favouring proximate choice: a prominal reference occurs only when the referent is highly accessible in the preceding discourse, while overt noun phrases are more often used when their referent is somewhat less accessible. For this reason, (28) is a very natural way to express the meaning in question. The form in (27) would be natural in a discourse context in which the referent of the matrix subject is going to play a major role in the subsequent discourse, or in which the referent of the complement subject was already obviative in the preceding discourse.

The next set of examples to be discussed are examples from texts analogous to the example in (28), with an obviative matrix subject and a proximate complement subject. The example in (29), for example, occurs in a discourse context in which the referent of the complement clause is referred to in the immediately preceding discourse and is proximate there, while the referent of the matrix subject, the nupik'a (analogous to Algonquian manitou), is not referred to in the immediately preceding text and was obviative when last referred to, about ten clauses previously.

(29) taxa-s n-'upxa-s-i ni?-s nupik'a-s pa$\frac{1}{2}$ qa ?in-i
then-OBV INDIC-know-OBV-INDIC the-OBV nupik'a-OBV EVID not
?in-i wisiya$\frac{1}{2}$-s
be-INDIC sweathouse-OBV
'Then the nupik'a$_i$ [obv] knew that he$_j$ [prox] was not
sweat-house$_k$ [obv].' (Tape 126, Side A, line 86)

The example in (30) is analogous with one difference. Here, the subject of the matrix verb is coreferential to the object of the complement clause. But it is otherwise analogous, with the matrix subject obviative and the complement subject proximate.

(30) k-'upxa?-s ni?-s k-sahani$\frac{1}{2}$wiy-na?t
SUBORD-know-OBV the-OBV SUBORD-angry-TRANS
'he$_i$ [obv] knew that they$_j$ [prox] were angry at him$_i$ [obv].'
(Boas Text 67: Wolf, line 10)

Here the referents of both the matrix subject and the complement subject are mentioned in the immediately preceding discourse, and the sentence in (30) continues their respective roles as proximate and obviative from the preceding discourse. Thus, we can understand why the preceding discourse determines the fact that the matrix subject here will be obviative and the complement subject proximate.

In situations like that in (30) in which the matrix subject is coreferential to the complement object, there exists, discourse context aside, a second syntactic way to express the meaning in question. The pair of elicited examples in (31) and (32) illustrate the two possibilities, in (31) with the matrix subject proximate and the complement subject obviative, in (32) with the reverse situation.

(31) **ma↓i qa↓wiy-ni k-wu·kat-aps.**
Mary think-INDIC SUBORD-see-INVERSE
'Mary$_i$ [prox] thinks that he$_j$ [obv] saw her$_i$ [prox].' (E)

(32) **ma↓i-s qa↓wiy-s-i k-wu·kat.**
Mary-OBV think-OBV-INDIC SUBORD-see
'Mary$_i$ [obv] thinks that he$_j$ [prox] saw her$_i$ [obv].' (J)

The example in (32) is analogous to the text example in (30). The example in (31) expresses the same basic meaning as that in (32), but with the matrix subject proximate and the complement subject obviative. Note, however, that this entails the the complement object be proximate, since it is coreferential to the matrix subject, and hence that the subordinate verb in (31) must be inverse, since its subject is obviative and its object proximate.

The text examples in (33) and (34) are analogous to (32) in that the matrix subject is proximate, the complement object is coreferential to the matrix subject and hence proximate as well, and the complement subject is thus obviative, so the complement verb is an inverse. The assignment of proximate and obviative in (33) is somewhat surprising in that the two participants here have the reverse status in the immediately preceding text, the Kuyokwe being obviative and the old man proximate, but the subsequent text suggests that this sentence involves a shift of point of view from that of the old man to that of the Kuyokwe, and the shift requires that both participants be represented by overt noun phrases in (33), despite their both being referred to in the immediately preceding text. This sentence is thus somewhat analogous to a paragraph-initial sentence in English.

(33) **kuyu?ki qa↓wiy-ni ¢xa↓ ?up↓-aps ni?-s nu↓?aqna?-s**
Kuyokwe think-INDIC FUT kill-INVERSE the-OBV old.man-OBV
'The Kuyokwe$_i$ [prox] thought that the old man$_j$ [obv] would kill them$_i$ [prox].' (Boas Text 72: Pine Cone, line 62)

The example in (34) differs in that here syntactic factors dictate the assignment of proximate and obviative, since the complement subject is possessed by a nominal that is coreferential to the matrix subject and hence it would not be possible for the complement subject to be proximate. As a result, the complement verb must be inverse.

(34) n-'upx-ni taxa-s tuxa ?at-k-s
INDIC-know-INDIC then-OBV almost ASP-SUBORD-ASP
ɬaxanxu?-naps ti-ɬnamu-?is
catch.up.to-INV wife-3POSS
'He$_i$ [prox] knew that his$_i$ [prox] wife$_j$ [obv] was about to catch up with him$_i$ [prox].' (Skinkuc Text, line 46)

The possibility of a higher clause with an obviative subject and its complement clause with a proximate subject can also arise in cases in which there are two levels of embedding, in which the complement of the main clause itself contains a further complement. The text example in (35) illustrates this possibility.

(35) qaɬwiy-ni k-cxaɬ qaɬwiy-s kuyu?ki-s ki?-in.
think-INDIC SUBORD-FUT think-OBV Kuyokwe-OBV SUBORD-be
'He$_i$ [prox] thought the Kuyokwe$_j$ [obv] would think that it was he$_i$ [prox].' (Boas Text 72, line 65)

In (35), we have three verbs, the main verb qaɬwiy-ni 'think', its complement verb qaɬwiys 'think' (in nonindicative obviative form), and the lower verb ki?in 'be', which is the complement of the lower of the two verbs meaning 'think'. Here, the subject of the main clause is coreferential to the subject of the most deeply embedded verb while the subject of the intermediate verb is different (kuyu?kis 'Kuyokwe-obv'). In this case, the subject of the highest and lowest verbs are proximate, while the subject of the intermediate verb is obviative. But the relation between the intermediate clause and the lowest clause is analogous to the situation illustrated in (28), (29), and (30) above, with the subject of the matrix verb obviative and the subject of the subordinate verb proximate.

Another situation in which the matrix subject can be obviative and the complement subject proximate arises with the indefinite subject construction. The indefinite subject construction is characterized by a distinct verbal suffix -(n)am, simple examples of which are illustrated in (36) and (37).

(36) taxa-s sukakati-nam-ni
then-OBV many-INDEF.SUBJ-INDIC
'Now there were a great number of people there.' (Coyote and Yawukiykam Text, line 369)

(37) n-'anaxam'-nam-ni qakiy-am-ni
INDIC-come.out-INDEF.SUBJ-INDIC say-INDEF.SUBJ-INDIC
'They came out and said:' (Boas Text 63: Coyote and Deer, line 51)

The example in (36) illustrates one usage of the indefinite subject construction, one corresponding to the English use of the noun 'people'. The example in (37) illustrates what is probably the most common use of this construction, where an actual group of people are denoted, but the exact makeup of the group is vague and where there the identity of those in the group is unimportant in the discourse. In (37), this group of people are the inhabitants of a town who are mentioned a number of times in the preceding text. As the example in (34) illustrates, the referent of the indefinite subject suffix is often understood to be the same across a

sequence of clauses in discourse. The indefinite subject construction is only used with intransitive verbs, the passive construction filling this role with transitive verbs in which the "semantic subject" is indefinite in the sense associated with the indefinite subject construction.

Indefinite subjects can be proximate or obviative. The examples in (36) and (37) involve proximate indefinite subjects, there being no major human referents in the discourse context competing for proximate status. When indefinite subjects compete with a clearly defined human referent for proximate status, the indefinite subject (almost?) always loses, and is thus obviative. This often happens in sentences containing more than one clause, and such sentences thus are one case to examine obviation operating across clauses. If there is a more clearly defined human referent in the sentence, it will normally be proximate and the indefinite subject will be obviative. Example (38) illustrates this with a proximate matrix subject and an obviative complement subject.

(38) taxa-s k-ʔupxa ni¢taha⸗
then-OBV SUBORD-know boy
tuxa k-¢ hu⸗ haqa⸗pa⸗ni-nam-is
almost SUBORD-FUT finish talk-INDEF.SUBJ-OBV
'Then the boy knew that the conversation was about over.'
(Literally: Then the boy$_i$ [prox] knew that the people$_j$ [obv] were almost finished talking.) (Tape 71, Second Part, line 231)

In (38), the indefinite subject is the complement subject, but in other cases it is the matrix subject. In such cases, following the principle that indefinite subjects lose out for proximate status to more clearly defined human referents, the matrix subject is normally proximate and the subordinate subject obviative. Examples illustrating this are give in (39) and (40).

(39) qa⸗wiy-nam-is k-¢xa⸗ qa ʔupi⸗-i⸗
think-INDEF.SUBJ-OBV SUBORD-FUT not kill-PASS
'they thought that they would not kill him.'
(Literally: 'they$_i$ [obv] thought that he$_j$ [prox] would not be killed' *or*
'they$_i$ [obv] thought that they$_i$ would not kill him$_j$ [prox]')
(Boas Text 72: Pine Cone, line 74)

In (39), the subordinate clause is grammatically passive, but its agent is understood to have the same referent as the subject of the matrix clause. This use of the passive construction, where the agent is interpreted to be the same as the indefinite subject in a preceding clause is actually very common in texts. The example in (40) is similar except that here we have two levels of embedding, the main clause subject being an obviative indefinite subject, the intermediate subject being proximate, and the lowest subject being obviative, but distinct in reference from the main clause subject.

(40) qaky-am-is-ni k-qaki k-qa qaqap-s
say-INDEF.SUBJ-OBV-INDIC SUBORD-say SUBORD-not be.so-OBV
'They$_i$ [obv] say she$_j$ [prox] said it$_k$ [obv] was not so.'
(Tape 127, Last Part, line 99)

The next set of examples illustrate cases in which both the subject of the matrix clause and the subject of the complement clause are obviative. Since more than one nominal in a sentence can be obviative, some of these examples involve cases in which the subjects of the two clauses are coreferential, while others involve cases in which the subjects are not coreferential. Consider first a case of the former sort, given in (41) in which the subjects of the two clauses are coreferential.

(41) qaɬwiy-s-i ʔumaɕnatqɬik̓amu-naps k̓iʔ skinkuɕ-s
think-OBV-INDIC make.fun.of.family.of(?)-INV Coyote-OBV
'Coyote thought he would make fun of his family.'
(Literally: 'Coyote$_i$ [obv] thought he$_i$ [obv] would make-fun-of-family-of him$_j$ [prox]'. (Tape NS.7, Story 3, line 79)

In (41), the proximate nominal is the object of the complement clause, while both subjects refer to Coyote and are obviative. Note that the complement verb here is inverse, since its subject is obviative and its object is proximate.

The next example involves a case in which both subjects are obviative but are not coreferential. In (42), there are four referents, one proximate and three obviative. The possessor of the complement of the copula verb is proximate, while the matrix subject, the complement subject, and the complement of the copula in the complement clause are all obviative.

(42) n-̓upxa-s-i ɕin ʔi-s ki-ʔin-s sit̓-is.
INDIC-see-OBV-INDIC only that-OBV SUBORD-be-OBV blanket-3POSS
'They$_i$ [obv] saw that this$_j$ [obv] was only his$_i$ [prox] blanket$_k$ [obv].'
(Boas Text 72, line 66)

2. Adverbial Clauses

The principles illustrated so far with complement clauses also apply to subordinate clauses serving an adverbial function. In (43), the matrix subject is obviative, the sole role of the proximate participant being that of object in the subordinate clause (which is thus inverse):

(43) Taxa-s ʔat qakik-s-i "sak sak sak"
then-OBV IMPERF say-OBV-INDIC
taxa-s ʔat k-̓upx-naps
then-OBV IMPERF SUBORD-see-INVERSE
'Then they$_i$ [obv] would say "sak sak sak" when they$_i$ [obv] see him$_j$ [prox].' (Boas Text 72: Pine Cone, line 23)

Subordinate clauses serving an adverbial function often occur as nominals, consisting of a determiner plus a clause, as in (44).

(44) Taxa-s ni?-s k-̓aɬqananuqiɬxuʔ-naps
then-OBV the-OBV SUBORD-carry.across.on.horseback-INV
taxa-s n-uɕinkqupikimik.
then-OBV INDIC-take.off.running
'Then when he$_j$ [obv] packed her$_i$ [prox] to the other side, she$_i$ [prox] took off running.' (Chief and Ogress Text, line 234)

In (44), the subordinate clause is nominalized, consisting of the determine **ni?s** 'the-obv' plus the subordinate clause **k̓a↓qananuqi↓xu?naps**. Note that the determiner is marked obviative, indicating that this nominal consisting of the subordinate clause is obviative.

3. "Headless" Relative Clauses

The final type of clause I will discuss is that of relative clauses. Relative clauses are not common in texts, except for headless relative clauses, in which the structure is Det + S, where the resulting NP (or DetP) is coreferential to a "pronominal" element in the relative clause. In (45), the element in question is obviative subject in the relative clause, as indicated by the obviative subject suffix on the verb, and obviative object in the matrix clause.

(45) **Taxa-s mi↓yax-ni ni?-s snaqayqap-s**
then-OBV chase-INDIC the-OBV roll-OBV
'He [prox] ran after that which was rolling [obv]'
(Literally: 'He$_i$ [prox] ran after the$_j$ [obv] it$_j$ [obv] was rolling' or 'He$_i$ [prox] ran after the thing$_j$ [obv] such that it$_j$ [obv] was rolling')
(Coyote and Yawukiykam Text, line 44)

Once again, the general principle that coreferential nominals in different clauses must agree in obviation is satisfied here, the element being obviative in both clauses. Note that in these cases the coreference might be viewed as arising from quantifier binding, the structure of the NP being something like 'the x such that x was rolling', though the Kutenai structure is more superficially simply 'the [it was rolling]'. In discussing these, I will refer to the Det+S as the matrix clause nominal (in this example **ni?s snaqayqaps** 'the [it was rolling]') and the possibly pronominal reference in the relative clause (the 'it' in the gloss 'the [it was rolling]') as the relative clause nominal.

In (45), the nominal containing the relative clause is obviative. But it can also be proximate. In (46), for example, the matrix clause nominal is the sole nominal in the matrix clause and is proximate.

(46) **?at yunaqa?-ni k-a↓q̓at̓i ↓awiya↓-s**
IMPERF many-INDIC SUBORD-pick huckleberry-OBV
'There were many who picked huckleberries'
(Literally: 'the ones$_i$ [prox] such that they$_i$ [prox] picked huckleberries$_j$ [obv] were many') (Boas Text 27: The Deluge, line 26)

The example in (46) also illustrated the possibility of the determiner being absent.

In (47), the matrix clause nominal is proximate and subject, with an understood obviative object (and thus an exception to the tendency for pronominal elements to be the preferred choice for proximates), and the relative clause nominal is also proximate and subject, with the complement of the copula verb obviative.

(47) n-̓upx-ni ni? k-̓inqaptik ki?anq̓a-nana-s
INDIC-see-INDIC the SUBORD-become buck-DIMIN-OBV
'Then the one who had become a young buck saw him.'
(Literally: 'the one$_i$ [prox] such that he$_i$ [prox] became a young buck$_j$ [obv] saw him$_k$ [obv]') (Boas Text 67: Wolf, line 25)

Relative clauses sometimes involve a type of syntactic nominalization (by which I mean a nominalization that results in a nominal or noun phrase, not one that involves a noun, analogous to gerund constructions in English) that involves a combination of a proclitic **ya-** in the verb complex and a suffix (or enclitic?) **-ki**, as in (48), both glossed 'NOM'.

(48) ¢xa-ɬ sani-ɬwiy-ni ma-niski-ɬ ni?-s hu
FUT angry-INDIC mother-2PL.POSS the-OBV 1
ya-qakin-ki
NOM-do.to-NOM
'Your mother [prox] will be angry because of what [obv] I did to her [prox]. (Skinku¢ Text, line 39)

Nominalizations involving **ya-** and **-ki** are most commonly used where the element in the relative clause that is coreferential to the nominal itself is not functioning as a syntactic argument (a subject or primary object) in the relative clause. In (48), for example, it is functioning as a secondary object of the ditransitive verb **qakin** 'do to' whose argument structure is 'A [subj] does B [secondary obj] to C [primary obj]'.

The example in (49) is a second example of a headless relative clause involving **ya-ki** nominalization though here it is the subject in the relative clause that is involved.

(49) xa-s k-̓upxa ni?-s ya-qasin-nut-aps-ki
then-OBV SUBORD-see the-OBV NOM-??-chase-INV-NOM
'then she$_i$ [prox] saw the one [obv] who had been after her$_i$ [prox].'
(Literally: 'then she$_i$ [prox] saw the one$_j$ [obv] such that he$_j$ [obv] had been after her$_i$ [prox].' (Tape 127, Last Part, line 209)

In (49), the matrix clause nominal is obviative, again the object of a direct transitive verb, while the coreferential relative clause nominal is obviative, serving as the subject in the relative clause. Since the subject of the matrix clause is proximate and is coreferential to the object of the relative clause, the latter is proximate as well, and the subordinate verb is inverse as a result.

The example in (50) is a fairly rare type of example of example involving an inverse verb both of whose arguments are obviative.

(50) k-ɬaxaɬ ʔupxa-¢ k-ɬatɬ ʔakɬiɬ-mu
SUBORD-arrive see-and SUBORD-PRVB ask-INSTR
ya-qasn-aps-is-ki
NOM-own-INVERSE-OBV-NOM
'When he [prox] got there and started asking about
the one [obv] who owned her [obv],'
(Literally: 'When he$_k$ [prox] got there and started asking about the one$_i$ [obv] such that he$_i$ [obv] owned her$_j$ [obv],') (Tape 21, line 130)

The use of the inverse in the subordinate clause in (50) is apparently motivated by the fact that although both arguments are obviative, the object is recoverable from the preceding text while the subject is not, and is hence in some sense more topical.

Contrast this with the example in (51), in which again both arguments in the relative clause are obviative, but in which the verb is direct rather than inverse.

(51) paɬ ki-ʔin-s ¢ahaɬ-s k-'itkin-s ¢upqaʔ-s
EVID SUBORD-be-OBV grass-OBV SUBORD-make-OBV deer-OBV
'it was grass that he had made into a deer'
(literally: 'that$_i$ [obv] such that he$_j$ [obv] had made it$_i$ [obv] into a deer$_k$ [obv] was grass$_l$ [obv]') (Boas Text 67: Wolf, line 85)

The proximate element does not occur in this sentence but is referred to in the surrounding text.

The example in (52) is another example in which both nominals in the relative clause are obviative.

(52) k-wu·kat niʔ-s ya-qaqap-s-ki titqaʔ-s
SUBORD-see the-OBV NOM-be.like-OBV-NOM man-OBV
'he saw what the men were like'
(Literally: 'he$_i$ [prox] saw the thing(?)$_j$ [obv] such that the men$_k$ [obv] were like it$_j$ [obv]') (Tape NS.28, No. 2, line 13)

In (52), both the subject and the understood pronominal complement in the relative clause are obviative.

It should be noted that one sometimes finds what are apparently instances of the same relative clause construction in which there is no determiner, but in which the ya-ki nominalization is used, as in (53).

(53) hu ¢xaɬ ¢xa-ni ya-qaɬ ʔitkin-ki ka·kin
I FUT say-INDIC NOM-in.that.way do-NOM wolf
niʔ-s pi'ak-s.
the-OBV long.ago-OBV
'I will tell you what [obv] Wolf [prox] did long ago [obv].'
(Boas Text 67: Wolf, line 1)

4. "Headed" Relative Clauses

The examples above all involve so-called headless relative clauses. Less common in texts are relative clauses with heads. Kutenai employs socalled internally-headed relative clauses, where the structure is exactly the same as that of socalled headless relative clauses, namely Det + S, except that the relative clause nominal in the relative clause is an overt nominal rather than being pronominal.

(54) ni?-s ma k-wu·kat paɬkiy-s misaɬ
the-OBV ASP SUBORD-see woman-OBV Mike
n̓-ip-s-i
INDIC-die-OBV-INDIC
'The woman that Mike saw died' (E)
(Literally: 'The$_i$ [obv] [Mike$_j$ [prox] saw the woman$_i$ [obv]] died.' or 'The one$_i$ [obv] such that Mike$_j$ [prox] saw the woman$_i$ [obv] died.')

The matrix subject in (54) is everything preceding the last word, n̓ipsi 'die', which is the matrix verb. This matrix subject consists of the determiner ni?s 'the-obv' followed by ma kwu·kat paɬkiys misaɬ, which is well-formed as a clause in the subordinative mood meaning 'Mike saw the woman'. Hence a literal translation would be 'the [Mike saw the woman] died'. The obviation system provides a way of indicating what is the so-called 'head' in the relative clause, in other words which nominal in the relative clause corresponds to the head in the English translation, or more accurately, which nominal in the relative clause is coreferential to the nominal in the matrix clause. In (54), the matrix nominal is obviative, as indicated both by the obviative form of the determiner ni?s and by the obviative subject form of the matrix verb n̓ipsi 'die'. Hence the so-called 'head', the nominal inside the relative clause coreferential to the matrix nominal, must be obviative as well, and since the sole obviative nominal in the relative clause is paɬkiys 'woman-obv', it must be the "head".

Compare (54) to (55), in which the matrix nominal and the coreferential nominal in the relative clause are proximate.

(55) ni? paɬkiy ma k-wu·kat misaɬ-s n̓-ip-ni
the woman ASP SUBORD-see Mike-OBV INDIC-die-INDIC
'The woman that saw Mike died.'
(Literally: 'the one$_i$ [prox] such that she$_i$ [prox] saw Mike$_j$ [obv] died') (E)

Because of the position of the nominal paɬkiy 'woman', (55) is less obviously an internally-headed relative clause, but I believe that it is probably best understood as one in which the nominal paɬkiy 'woman' is fronted within the relative clause, the word order most likely reflecting the fact that this is an elicited sentence with somewhat complex structure whose order mirrors the order in the English as an artifact of the elicitation situation. Most instances in texts of relative clauses with an overt "head" employ the typical predicate-initial order of Kutenai.

The following examples illustrate examples of relative clauses from texts. They reflect the same basic principles that coreferential nominals must agree in obviation across clause boundaries, but that otherwise there are no syntactic restrictions on the assignment of obviation.

(56) si↓ haq́maxu-mu-ni ni?-s k-↓a ?aymaxu ¢upqa?-s
ASP scare-INSTR-INDIC the-OBV SUBORD-back carry.two deer-OBV
'he scared them with the two Deer he was carrying'
(Literally: 'he$_i$ [prox] scared them$_k$ [obv] with the ones$_j$ [obv] such that he$_i$ [prox] was carrying-two-of deer$_j$ [obv]')
(Boas Text 63: Coyote and Deer, line 42)

In (56), the proximate participant is denoted by the subject of both the matrix and relative clauses, while the obviative participant is object of both clauses.

The following example is one in which the proximate nominal is in the relative clause and the only nominal in the matrix clause is obviative.

(57) n-anq́↓a?-s-i ni?-s k-mitxa ¢upqa?-s.
INDIC-go.distance.before.dying-OBV-INDIC the-OBV SUBORD-shoot deer-OBV
'The deer [obv] that he [prox] shot went a distance before dying.'
(Literally: 'the [he shot the deer] went a distance before dying' *or* 'the one [obv] such that he [prox] shot the deer [obv] went a distance before dying') (Gravelle & Morgan 1979/1989, page 109)

It is clear that the nominal ni?s kmitxa ¢upqa?s 'the [he shot the deer]' refers to the deer and not to the one who shot the deer, since the determiner ni?s 'the-obv' is marked obviative and the matrix verb nanq́↓a?si is marked as having an obviative subject, which means that the so-called 'head' in the relative clause must be obviative, and the nominal ¢upqa?s 'deer-obv' in the relative clause satisfies this, while the understood subject does not, since it is proximate, as indicated by the absence of obviative subject marking on the subordinate verb kmitxa 'shoot'. I assume, though I do not have the actual data for this, that if the determiner and the matrix verb were proximate in form, then the sentence would have meant 'The person who shot the deer went a distance before dying'.

The example in (58) is analogous: the fact that this nominal refers to the tail is clear from the fact that the determiner is obviative and the nominal for 'tail' in the relative clause is obviative.

(58) ni?-s k-'iyakin ?in↓ak ?a·kinuq́ma?na-s
the-OBV SUBORD-put.up chicken.hawk tail-OBV
'[Then they watched] the tail [obv] that Chicken Hawk [prox] had put up.'
(Literally: 'the thing$_i$ [obv] such that Chicken Hawk$_j$ [prox] had put up the tail$_i$ [obv]') (Boas Text 27: The Deluge, line 124)

The example in (59) involves two relative clauses, one embedded within the other, although this example, like the occasional example in texts, violates one of the principles I have described in that it contains two proximate nominals, the matrix subject ʔa·qɬ¢maknik̓ 'Indians' and the embedded nominal ni ʔ titqat̓ 'the man'.

(59) qaqaʔ-ni ʔa·qɬ¢maknik̓ ... niʔ-s ya-qakiʔ-ki
be.that.way-INDIC Indians the-OBV NOM-say-NOM
niʔ k̓-upsnam niʔ titqat̓
the SUBORD-be.on.way the man
'Indians are like what the man who was on his way said'
(Literally: 'Indians$_k$ [prox] are-like the [the [the man was on his way] said it]' *or* 'Indians$_k$ [prox] are-like the thing$_i$ [obv] such that the one$_j$ [prox] such that the man$_j$ [prox] is on his way said it$_i$ [obv]'
(NS.21, Story 10, line 38)

Apart from this anomaly, the nominal ni ʔ titqat̓ 'the man' in (59) is functioning as the subject of the more deeply embedded verb k̓upsnam 'be on his way' with the resultant meaning 'the man was on his way', which combines with the determiner niʔ 'the' to form a nominal whose free English translation is 'the man who was on his way' and whose more literal translation is 'the [the man was on his way]'. This nominal in turn serves as the subject of qakiʔ 'say', yielding a clause meaning 'the man who was on his way said it', which is then nominalized with ya-ki and combined with the determiner niʔs to form a nominal whose free translation is 'what the man who was on his way said' and whose literal translation is 'the [the [the man was on his way] said it]'. The fact that the determiner niʔs is obviative in (59) makes it clear that the meaning is 'what the man who was on his way said' rather than 'the man who was on his way who said it'.

5. Conclusion

The many examples discussed here are primarily intended to illustrate a negative conclusion: that there is no evidence of any syntactic conditions governing obviation across clause boundaries apart from those that also apply within clauses, that there can be no more than one proximate per sentence and coreferential nominals must agree in obviation. In particular there is no evidence of any conditions reminiscent of 'binding' conditions, no conditions by which proximates are preferred in higher positions than obviatives.

NOTES

[1] I will use the commonly used name "Kutenai" throughout this paper. The name used by speakers of the language in Canada is "Ktunaxa". The research for this paper was supported by Research Grant 410-88-0267 from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and by the National Science

Foundation Grant # 9120438. I am indebted to Elizabeth Gravelle, a native speaker of Kutenai, for transcribing and translating the texts from which examples are cited here, and to Lawrence Morgan both for discussion and for making various of his materials available to me. See Morgan (1991) for a detailed description of the phonology and morphology of Kutenai.

2 The examples cited in this paper are of four types and are annotated accordingly. Some of the examples are from texts, either ones published in Boas (1918) or ones collected by Lawrence Morgan and transcribed and translated by Elizabeth Gravelle. Examples from texts of the latter category are identified by tape number. The examples from these texts are annotated accordingly. The examples from Boas (1918) have been converted to the modern orthography by me. Both types of text examples may contain some errors because some forms I have not had the opportunity to check. The remaining two types of examples cited are ones produced in elicitation (marked E) or ones presented for judgment (marked J). Where possible, I cite text examples, since I assume these to be more reliable data. I also assume that elicited examples are more reliable than examples judged acceptable. While text examples are most reliable, examples of the other sorts are often better examples for illustrating the points being made, and such examples are only given on the assumption that analogous (though perhaps more opaque) examples from texts could be provided. For this reason, I will in many places in this paper provide both kinds of examples, some of types E or J for clarity, and some from texts to show that the construction illustrated is actually used.

3 The fourth word in (7), represented as n-ˀin-i involves the combination of the indicative proclitic n- with the verb stem ʔin 'be'. When the proclitic n- (or the subordinative proclitic k-) combine with a stem beginning with /ʔ/, the result is a ejective consonant n̓ (or k̓). I represent this in the hyphenation for morpheme boundaries by placing the ejective symbol above the hyphen, conveying that morphologically it goes with the stem that follows while phonetically it goes with the consonant that precedes.

REFERENCES

Boas, Franz. 1918. Kutenai tales. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 59. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.

Dryer, Matthew S. 1991. Subject and inverse in Kutenai. In Papers from the American Indian Languages Conferences, held at the University of California, Santa Cruz, July and August 1991, Occasional Papers On Linguistics 16. 183-202, ed. by James E. Redden. Carbondale, Illinois: Dept. of Linguistics.

-----. 1992. A comparison of the obviation systems of Kutenai and Algonquian. Papers from the 23rd Annual Algonquian Conference, ed. by William Cowan, 119-163. Ottawa: Carleton University.

-----. 1994. The discourse function of the Kutenai inverse. Voice and inversion, ed. by T. Givón, 65-99. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

-----. 1996. Grammatical relations in Ktunaxa (Kutenai): The Belcourt Lecture delivered before the University of Manitoba on 24 February 1995. Voices of Rupert's Land: Winnipeg, Canada.

Garvin, Paul L. 1947. Kutenai grammar. Unpublished Indiana University dissertation. (The majority of was published with little or no change in a series of articles in IJAL.)

-----. 1948. Kutenai III: morpheme distributions (prefix, theme, suffix). International Journal of American Linguistics 14. 171-187.

-----. 1958. A descriptive technique for the treatment of meaning. Language 34. 1-32.

Gravelle, Elizabeth, and Lawrence Morgan. 1979. A manuscript dictionary of Kutenai. Kootenay Language Project, Kootenay Indian Area Council, Cranbrook, B.C. Unpublished revised version, 1989.

Morgan, Lawrence. 1991. A description of the Kutenai language. Unpublished University of California at Berkeley dissertation.